

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

UNITED STATES

v.

JOCELYN RUSSO

*
*
*
*
*
*

CRIM NO. 12-740

**ORDER REGARDING USE OF VIDEO CONFERENCING/TELECONFERENCING
FOR FELONY PLEAS AND/OR SENTENCINGS**

In accordance with Standing Order 2020-06, this Court finds:

☒ That the Defendant (or the Juvenile) has consented to the use of video
teleconferencing/teleconferencing to conduct the proceeding(s) held today, after consultation
with counsel; and

☒ That the proceeding(s) to be held today cannot be further delayed without serious harm
to the interests of justice, for the following specific reasons:

Accordingly, the proceeding(s) held on this date may be conducted by:

☒ Video Teleconferencing

☐ Teleconferencing, because video teleconferencing is not reasonably available for the
following reason:

☐ The Defendant (or the Juvenile) is detained at a facility lacking video
teleconferencing capability.

☐ Other:

Date: June 29, 2022



Honorable Susan D. Wigenton
United States District Judge

ATTACHMENT A

The Court finds that the sentencing for a violation of supervised release hearing to be held on June 29, 2022, cannot be further delayed without serious harm to the interests of justice, for the following reasons:

1. To permit the defendant to obtain a speedy resolution of her case through a timely sentencing to afford appropriate punishment and rehabilitation.
2. To permit the Government to obtain a resolution of the case so that the Government, already operating in a restricted capacity due to the emergency, may appropriately focus its resources on other, emerging criminal matters. The Government has asked for this case to be resolved today through a timely sentencing.
3. To ensure that the Court is not overwhelmed by cases and proceedings at the conclusion of this period of emergency. Currently, District Judges in New Jersey handle a substantially larger docket of cases than Judges in other Districts in the United States. New criminal cases continue to be assigned by the Court during the emergency. If the Court cannot resolve matters now by guilty plea and sentencing, the resulting backlog will overwhelm the Court's ability to function effectively. The concern of such congestion and the particular harm that likely will be caused by delays in the processing of cases and matters in the future is particularly acute in this emergency, at least given that it is unknown when this emergency will subside and when the Court will be able to function at normal capacity.